

ANARCHY 56 | 2s. 30cents

Emma Goldman IN A MAN'S WORLD...



The Eclipse of Woman	Dora Russell	289
The Best of Both Worlds	Harriet Unwin	302
Discrimination Survives		310
The Tragedy of Woman's Emancipation	Emma Goldman	312
Mr. James and Sergeant Challenor	Martin Ennals	316
Cover (from an early photograph of Emma Goldman) by	Rufus Segar	

Other issues of ANARCHY

VOLUME 1, 1961: 1. Sex-and-Violence, Galbraith*; 2. Worker's control†; 3. What does anarchism mean today?; 4. Deinstitutionalisation; 5. Spain 1936†; 6. Cinema†; 7. Adventure playgrounds†; 8. Anthropology; 9. Prison; 10. Mac-
Innes, Industrial decentralisation.

VOLUME 2, 1962: 11. Paul Goodman, A. S. Neill; 12. Who are the anarchists? 13. Direct action; *14. Disobedience; *15. The work of David Wills; 16. Ethics. of anarchism, Africa; 17. Towards a lumpenproletariat; 18. Comprehensive schools; 19. Theatre: anger and anarchy; 20. Non-violence, Freud; 21. Secondary modern; 22. Cranston's dialogue on anarchy.

VOLUME 3, 1963: 23. Housing, squatters, do-it-yourself; 24. Community of Scholars; 25. Technology, cybernetics; 26. CND, Salesmanship, Thoreau; 27. Youth; 28. The future of anarchism; 29. The Spies for Peace Story; 30. The community workshop; 31. Self-organising systems, Beatniks; the State; 32. Crime; 33. Alex Comfort's anarchism†; 34. Science fiction, Workless teens.

VOLUME 4, 1964: 35. House and home; 36. Arms of the law; 37. Why I won't vote; 38. Nottingham; 39. Homer Lane; 40. Unions and workers' control; 41. The land; 42. Indian anarchism; 43. Parents and teachers. 44. Transport. 45. Anarchism and Greek thought; 46. Anarchism and the historians.

VOLUME 5, 1965: 47. Towards freedom in work; 48. Lord of the flies; 49. Automation; 50. The anarchist outlook; 51. Blues, R'n'b, Pop, Folk; 52. Limits of pacifism; 53. After school; 54. Buber, Landauer, Muhsam; 55. Mutual aid and social evolution; 56. A man's world.

PLEASE NOTE: Issues 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, and 33 are out of print.

IF YOU DO NOT HAVE A SUBSCRIPTION

you are probably being supplied by one of our volunteer agents or an enterprising newsagent. But there is a very small number of distributors who fail to pay us for sales. So if your source of supply dries up, don't think we have expired. Keep our address and write for a subscription.

Subscribe to ANARCHY

Single copies 2s. (30c.). Annual Subscription (12 issues) 26s. (\$3.50). By airmail 47s. (\$7.00). Joint annual subscription with FREEDOM the anarchist weekly (which readers of ANARCHY will find indispensable) 42s. (\$6.00). Cheques, P.O.s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, 17a Maxwell Road, London, S.W.6, England. Tel.: RENown 3736.

... IN A MAN'S WORLD

THE ECLIPSE OF WOMAN

Dora Russell

MRS. PANKHURST'S STATUE stands hard by the Houses of Parliament and, not long since, an addition to the statue commemorated her daughter Christabel. Very large numbers of people in Great Britain assume, when they think of the matter at all, that the battle of women for equal rights with men has long since been won. A closer look at the present day status of women, however, makes one wonder whether there is a real basis for this optimistic assumption. The recent publication by the National Council for Civil Liberties of its pamphlet on the disabilities under which women still suffer will reinforce such misgivings.

To detail the manifold information of this pamphlet here would be inappropriate. What concerns me here is not so much the victories of varying importance still waiting to be won, as the question, to me the most important of all, as to how far women are able to influence the shape and trend of society as a whole. Many women, of course, especially in political life in this country, deny that any special stress should be laid on a woman's point of view. It is interesting to note that this attitude is in marked contrast to that obtaining in countries where women reached equality recently as part of a general revolution. In such countries one finds that women form themselves into huge united organisations, who take it for granted that they are there to speak "as women", while the ratio of women to men in their national assemblies is higher than in our own Parliament.

In Italy the vote came to women after World War II: one of the first tasks of the developing women's movement was to care for the families left destitute and maimed by the war, hence they have always combined a strong maternal attitude with their feminism. In India the great Women's Congresses are more influential than such gatherings in Britain. While, even in a small country like Albania, women now enjoy great prestige and their public work is held in high esteem. They are in fact given some preference over men for some superior positions.

In Britain in almost any office or Civil Service department one will find women to a large extent employed on the more mechanical

DORA RUSSELL, who for many years ran Beacon Hill School, is the author of *The Right to be Happy*, *In Defence of Children*, and *Hypatia, or Woman and Knowledge*.

work, or—if in the upper grades—acting as lieutenant, right hand, or “office wife” to the man at the top. Nor is this because the women lack the ability to become top executives or administrators; on the contrary, often it is their very ability as second in command that bolsters up the position of their chief. Possibly women lack the bounce and self-confidence to take on responsibility, but this is largely due to their education and the general estimate of them as “second class” citizens. Milton’s “He for God only, she for God in him” has sunk deep into our social and economic pattern. Yet take a look at women in those spheres recognised by tradition as peculiarly theirs—as midwives, mothers, chancellor of the exchequer in the home—here is no lack of initiative or shouldering of responsibility.

The education of women requires our attention, the more so as it was the subject not long since of a controversy sparked off by Sir John Newsom in the *Observer*. It was argued, among other points, that an academic, over-rational, theoretical type of learning was unsuited to women, that it also unfitted them for the more concrete and instinctive occupations of maternity and child care. The male contributions to the discussion were remarkable in illustrating how great a degree of prejudice still exists in Western countries against women of high intelligence and learning, of which there is further proof in the very small percentage of women able to get to the Universities, to study medicine, or to reach the top posts in any intellectual profession. Nor did it seem to occur to anyone that this prejudice—and many other signs—indicates that there is something very wrong with the education of men, whose curriculum and mental attitudes are obsolete and little adapted to the world in which they have to live to-day.

To take a small example: the first secondary schools for girls, founded by the Girls’ Public Day School Trust, were not obliged to struggle against the stranglehold of the Classics on education. For the most part, their pupils concentrated on modern languages and the sciences, cramming Latin and Greek only when these were required for admission to a University. But the persistence of classical education for men of our upper classes has been a powerful and in many respects adverse influence on educational advance as on our political and economic life. While not decrying the enriching of our imagination and language by classical studies, one cannot help reflecting on the countless small boys construing the exploits of the Roman legions in Gaul and Britain, and seeing themselves as the Caesars of the future, conquering “regions Caesar never knew, over which their posterity has held sway”—that is, until this day and age. Greek rationalism and mathematics have, however, been a most potent influence on the evolution of our present day society.

Such is the fear of women that it has been, by tradition, essential to a man’s education that he should, from an early age, be removed from feminine influence—sons were taken from their mothers to begin a process of hardening for knighthood, or to go to the monastery for learning; at a later date we find the young boy hustled off to prep school; while, only the other day, I read a statement by a

headmaster that all children should spend some time at boarding school, to get them away from their mothers.

In so far as education for women was considered at all, men’s first notions appear to have been that it should not only differ from that of men, but should, in all respects, be related to men’s needs.

Not to elaborate on the notions of feminine personality that have prevailed down the ages, let us quote from the *Sermons for Young Women* of Dr. Fordyce, much read when Mary Wollenstonecraft was preparing to write her *Vindication of the Rights of Women* in the eighteenth century. Women, according to Dr. Fordyce, should be “meek, timid, yielding, complacent, sweet, benign and tender”; their propensity to “melt into affectionate sorrow” is their great charm; while “war, commerce, exercises of strength and dexterity, abstract philosophy and all the abstruser sciences are not for women”. And many must be familiar with Rousseau’s notion of the functions of women: “to please, to be useful to us, to make us love and esteem them, to educate us when young and take care of us when grown up, to advise, to console us, to render our lives easy and agreeable: these are the duties of women at all times and what they should be taught in their infancy”.

Before relegating this thesis to the antique past, let us reflect for one moment on the type of activity and morals inculcated week by week in the women of to-day by the women’s magazines with their five and six million circulation—a most potent educational influence on the younger generation. Is their point of view so very different from that of Rousseau, or the Rev. Dr. Fordyce?

At the same time compare the many aids to beauty and hints on sex appeal contained in these journals with the terms of the Act passed by our Parliament in 1770, which laid down that “all women of whatever age, rank or profession or degree, whether virgin, maid or widow that shall from and after such Act impose upon, seduce or betray into matrimony any of His Majesty’s subjects, by means of scent, paints, cosmetics, washes, artificial teeth, false hair, Spanish wool, iron stays, hoops, high heeled shoes or bolstered hips shall incur the penalty of the law now in force against witchcraft and like misdemeanours, and that the marriage upon conviction shall stand null and void.” I wonder if this Act has ever been repealed—how devastating might be its effect nowadays!

The early feminists can scarcely be blamed for seeking to prove that women could learn and do all that became a man—after all, it is a man’s world in which women have to live. Nor, even if it were desirable, is there much scope in present day society for sex differences in education. We live in a utilitarian state, in which the chief value of the individual is measured by the service or the function which he or she performs. Our educational factories, year by year, must turn out a sufficient production quota of civil servants, doctors, dentists, lawyers, managers, advertising agents, technologists, scientists, teachers, skilled workers and efficient instruments in the supply of goods and services.

Obviously, practically every one of these jobs can be equally well performed by a man or a woman; at least, this is the assumption on which, allowing for certain discriminations against women which still exist, our organisation as a community is based. We further require of these units in our society that they should be sufficiently disciplined to go to work at stated times, to work stated hours, and, on the whole, to remain in the chosen occupation most or all of their working life. To endure this discipline, which is an integral requirement of industrial civilisation, the individual must acquire and hold a belief in the ultimate aims and purposes to which the elaborate machine, of which he is a small part, is directed. These aims are, in fact, called in question by many individuals and groups at the present time: this is one reason for the frustration which undoubtedly exists, especially among women and young people. To this point we will return later.

Thus increasing stress is laid nowadays on vocational education, a fact sometimes deplored by the administrators of Universities in which the ancient traditions of learning and research for their own sake still survive. But, since training for a function, in a highly organised society, becomes steadily more essential and complex, it begins to take up more time and to dwarf all other considerations and educational needs.

Now it is a serious error either for the individual or for society as a whole to make the "work function" the central point and focus of life and education. For in performing, however well, a function for which an individual has been trained, he or she is not necessarily acting as a complete human being. Moreover, stressing work function unduly, we begin to think of people as neuters, or even as automata.

What I wish to emphasise most strongly here is that "work function" is only a small part of an individual. A human being has many other functions, as citizen, husband or wife, father or mother, thinker or dreamer. Both in education and in life we tend to split the human personality into these separate compartments, making it difficult for the man or woman to express himself or herself as a whole. We separate work from enjoyment, home from the outside world, imply a conflict between marriage and a career.

Of late I have been much struck by the frequent assumption that marriage and parenthood are a sort of trap, the virtual end of a woman, as well as of a man, as a freely developing individual. Surely to fall in love, to have children, should represent a new and wonderful stage in the unfolding of a human personality; it is tragic to envelop this with a sense of resentment and unwilling personal sacrifice.

Does this attitude arise because individuals have come to believe that their roles in society as a whole are also those most important to themselves? Is this an acceptance of the values of society or the State then, and, if so, what are these values?

The dilemma of the split between the more or less impersonal life of the job and the personal life of home is one which, in the present state of opinion and social organisation, bears most heavily on women. To suggest that they should be educated mainly for maternal functions

is patently absurd, when one realises that for most of them the choice between marriage and a career no longer exists. One third of the labour force which keeps our economy going and contributes to our wealth is composed of women. Of these about one half now are married. In the near future it is likely that the proportion of married women gainfully employed will rise still further, firstly because the sexes are now more evenly balanced in numbers and secondly because both men and women are marrying and starting their families much younger than in the days of their parents and grandparents.

Since our society cannot now, apparently, do without the contribution made by women's work and there is no pool of life-long spinsters on which to draw, we are faced with the necessity of making it possible for mothers to work outside the home without harmful results to their children or too great a drain on their own energy and health. The confusion that exists in the minds of our administrators about this far from simple problem is shown by the frenzied appeals of the Ministry of Education to married women teachers to return to work, coupled with the absolute refusal of local authorities to carry out the terms of the 1944 Education Act, which expressly laid down the provision of nursery schools.

Some social scientists have been marking out a nice, neat pattern for the life of a woman in the future, according to which she will do some kind of work after leaving school, University or Training College. She will then spend a period having two or three children, returning to work—after some re-training—when these are of school age. The drawback to this plan is that, like part-time work, it means that women will inevitably do the less skilled tasks and will be looked upon as a pool of labour to fill in gaps as required. To pursue a profession or skilled job continuously and to be valued for this as an individual will scarcely be possible in these circumstances.

There is really no other way of solving the problem of a mother at work with benefit to her as well as the children than by the provision of nursery schools, clubs and play centres suited to different ages. Frequent objection is made that family life is broken up if each member, from an early age, starts to go his or her own way, to the neglect of the ties which should bind them to father and mother, brothers and sisters. Above all, mother should be there for the young ones, who will suffer greatly if they lack the security and warmth of her care in early years, whilst the older children will become delinquent or disgruntled if they cannot come back from school to the cosiness of a home and a mother receptive to their confidences.

To me these arguments do seem to have some validity, but they lie oddly in the mouths of many of those who advance them. For these objectors are, by and large, those very persons in government and industry who create the social and economic system which presents mothers with this dilemma.

When one looks at the whole background, physical, social, economic, of the modern biological family, the remarkable thing is that it manages to survive at all. To begin with, what social

researchers somewhat unfortunately call the "nuclear" family, consisting of mother, father and two or three children living in their separate little box of a flat or house, is quite a new development. Previously the family was much more of a clan, in which children grew up in close association with grandparents, many aunts, uncles and cousins. Studies in the East End have shown how tenacious these relationships are when married couples live either with or near the older generation. Mothers and daughters still shop and housekeep almost jointly and see each other four or five times a week. Village life, until the younger people began to move away to the towns, allowed of even closer attachment between the generations. Sometimes this could be excessive, in that elderly sons and daughters remained at home with a still child-like attitude to their aging, surviving parent. In the larger towns nowadays, planning, which plants the small family units out into new towns or housing estates, leaves behind the Grans and Granpas either in the sad, dilapidated old premises, or else perched up in one of the modern blocks with their dizzy gangways.

Once more we observe the increasing tendency for each individual to live a separate existence, depending on the State and community for the care and services previously rendered by the family. Apart from breakfast and week-end meals families no longer often eat together; the home is empty all day except for the mother and the youngest children, unless she also goes out to work. It is not surprising that mothers have recently been complaining of loneliness and isolation from the life of the community, or that many of them go out to work as soon as possible for the sake of companionship with other women and a sense of "belonging".

That ideal home with the fridge and washing machine and streamlined kitchen—as advertised by the women's magazines—is seen to be a hollow sham. A snare, too, is the "women's world apart" in which these journals perpetuate, for adult women, the fairy tale world of childhood in which princess meets prince and lives happy ever after. To the opium administered by the women's magazines can be attributed to a large extent the apathy of younger women to-day as regards certain of their interests, and the ineffectiveness of women in the political world.

But if the home now lacks former human warmth, the outside world is no better. Take political life: I have never been able to understand why we should have wanted women in politics, if not because they are women and not men. But the politician and the career woman do not agree with this. In politics, a sexless citizen functionary in each of us is deemed to exercise its judgment between the varying programmes presented to the voter. In fact, as we all know, rational choice is possibly the last factor influencing the average voter: prejudices, sex differences, confused emotions of all kinds play their part. And political women more and more deny that Parliament is anything but a career for them as for men; they toe the Party line more assiduously than their male colleagues; they argue that, because they represent all their constituents, therefore special championship of

women's causes is out of place. This assumption works very well in maintaining the dominance of male values, but one does not notice that Trade Union members or company directors in Parliament fail, directly or indirectly, to support their own interests. And never was the male viewpoint on sex more blatant in politics than in the debates not long since on the iniquitous Street Offences Bill, which, in our attitude to prostitutes, set us back to the time before Josephine Butler's magnificent crusade on their behalf. Another example, this time of women expressing their specific view on a sex question, is the campaign in the 1920's by the Labour women to get advice on family limitation accepted as right and proper and given as an integral part of maternity care. This campaign raised an outcry against women for "dragging sex into politics". Their aim is not yet fully achieved in this country, although the population question is now crucial for our overcrowded island and for world policies.

Are not, however, individuals far more independent in these days, and have they not, in consequence, greater freedom in discussion of sex matters and in their sexual behaviour? It is perfectly true that freedom from taboos is important, as is the decline in the double standard of morality as between men and women. Social and religious teachers have frequently insisted on love for our fellow creatures as the basic factor in social cohesion. Love is not primarily of the spirit; it flows from the biological sanctions of sex and parental feeling. It can be sublimated or extended into love for the children of others, for our own people, for the whole human race. But such extension will not take place if society ceases to value the personal sources of this love, between young lovers, husbands and wives, members of a family, the young for the old. Where the lonely individual has to make his way and come to terms with the juggernaut of large scale organisation, love will count for little and devil take the hindmost will be the motto.

It seems to me that nowadays we have a very great deal more sex, with little increase, even, it may be, a decrease, in the volume of love. Women are so eager to emulate men that they have carried this aspiration even into the sexual sphere, approximating to men in their sex relations and taking sex, as do vast numbers of men, as the satisfaction of a purely physical appetite. I would not wish women to pretend, as the Victorians tried to do, that physical sex enjoyment does not exist for women, nor would I wish to give the impression of condemning casual sex encounters. But, if we are to speak of *love*, this also does not exist without some mutual feeling for and understanding of each other's personality. And women could do more to make men understand that the question "do you really love me?" is not without meaning.

The emphasis on sex, as opposed to parenthood, is yet another example of the dominance of male concepts. For men, biologically speaking, sex and procreation are one and the same act. For women the two exist quite distinct from one another. The moment of sexual pleasure is one thing: the emotional and actual experience of the long

period of pregnancy quite another. It seems strange that women have not given more attention to the psychological, economic and social consequences of this difference. Much of their political weakness flows from their failure to make those demands on society that their maternal role requires. In their enthusiasm for conquering men's world, they failed to defend the world that was their own. Not only that, but in their early political struggles, they joined with men in giving a low status to the bearing and rearing of children and concern with domestic life.

The reaction, described by Betty Friedan in *The Feminine Mystique*, which has led women to deny their own intelligence and education and retreat into the role of housewife and mother, is equally mistaken. It is not solely in the home and in one family, that children need to be nurtured and defended. A thousand and one demands in their name have to be made on our affluent and bellicose society and its myopic planners.

Stress on the sex act, with all the glamour with which the advertising world surrounds it for the adolescent, intensifies the narcissism which is not unnatural at that stage of development. Women become preoccupied with aids to eternal youth and beauty, young men aspire to be pop singers, to show off on motor bikes, to despise girls, to shun the trap of marriage and to find in homosexual relations not only a natural expression of sex at that age, but also a convenient way of avoiding unwanted babies. On the whole it is the male "image" that prevails. Those who are old enough to remember the vogue of the "Gaiety girls" and the plump pantomime "boys" will note that the most admired performer in the variety world to-day is the slim young male. When women appear, on the whole, in figure and dress, they emulate the male idol. In spite of all the "free love", there is little balance and harmony here between the sexes. Balance and harmony presupposes the recognition of differences to be brought together, whereas it is the fallacy of thinking that equality is the same as being identical which prevails.

And when we talk of free love how often do we reflect that this whole concept is negated by the offer of sex for sale? Women can still sell their sex in the hope of a lifelong meal-ticket from a well-to-do husband, or in successive marriages and divorces, to grow affluent on alimony; prostitution is on the increase; gigolos seek rich women patrons, homosexuals patrons of their own sex.

Recently there has been much discussion about the increase of illegitimate children. These are not only born to so-called ignorant and innocent girls, they appear at all levels of society and some are born to women who, in the view of the stern moralist, are old enough to know better. An encouraging feature of this state of affairs is that the stern moralist is no longer setting the pace. Neither those who help the unmarried mother nor she herself is inclined to accept her predicament as shameful. But her economic dilemma, side by side with that of the deserted wife or the widow with young children, is bringing women up sharply up against the diminished sense of responsi-

bility of men for the children they have begotten whether in or out of wedlock. In a fairly recent debate on widows' pensions, Mr. Douglas Houghton, M.P., expressed his surprise that, in the changing and dangerous world in which we live, women should still commit the economic support of themselves and their children to their marriage lines. The many anomalies about widows' pensions go to show the absurdity of hanging the support of a woman with children, or an elderly woman who has spent her life in domesticity, simply on the fact of her legal marriage and its duration. What mothers need help and money and pensions for is the—at present unpaid—work which they do in the home, which is a service to society and not only to the husband, however stable the marriage. Moreover a long period of marriage ending in divorce deprives the wife of the ultimate status of widow. It is not surprising that men, who are aware of what the State will now do for their children and the fact that their wives can earn, do show less economic responsibility and respect for the marriage tie. Neither are wives exempt from this accusation. But in fact, though there may be many husbands who share common family duties, the wife, having lost her pre-industrial status as the centre of the family, finds more and more burdens heaped upon her. She earns for her children, keeps and decorates the family home, cooks, cleans, mends for husband and children, hunts for a place to live, helps to drive and clean the family car, if it exists. And week by week is subjected to a blast of propaganda urging her never to look outside the walls of her home.

What really does happen to the children? Are they really loved? Many of them are deprived of one parent or the other, by divorce if not by death, a shocking number of them are taken into the care of local authorities on account of the cruelty and neglect of their parents, or the fact that society itself is so neglectful that their whole family has no home to live in. The discovery that the beating up of young babies by their parents is not uncommon has recently shocked doctors and the public. Whether we like it or not, the only solution for all this confusion is that the community should take full responsibility for seeing that women with young children, whether wives, widows or unmarried, should have all the support and help that will be needed for the children to fulfil themselves as human beings and as citizens. So long as the machine age continues, it is not possible to return to the old style family system, though we should still try to see that education and living conditions foster and keep alive family ties. Let those who do enjoy the comforts of family life reflect on the meaning for children of those cases quite often reported in the Press when brothers and sisters taken "into care" vanish into separate institutions and may never find each other again so long as they live.

So far, then, the education and emancipation of women would seem to have done little more, in our own country, than fit women more neatly into the existing structure of industrial society, a society which would also appear, from the foregoing, to be inimical to their deepest interests and needs. The present state of the world is the

measure, not of women's success, but rather of their failure. What do they get for all the work and services that they perform? To what extent, for instance, does our State carry out those projects which women consider important? Do women agree that vast sums be spent for nuclear arms, space rockets and war, while biology, medicine, the social sciences and education are starved? Ought not women to make themselves heard on such vital top-level decisions?

To me it has always seemed that the challenge which faces women in the modern world is something much deeper than the struggle for political or economic rights. We have been discussing here the inroads of the State into our private lives with, as must be admitted, some benefit to the people. But what in effect is this State, on which we tend to rely more and more to play father and mother to its citizens? It is mechanical, bureaucratic, power-loving, sadistic, war-like, repressive. By its very nature, history and principles, it cannot deal constructively with human problems. It is founded on the principle of keeping order by force within the State and by force giving battle to enemies without. In accord with this concept, for instance, it seeks to deal with crime and juvenile delinquency by a great increase in the pay of the police, while insulting and underpaying the teaching and nursing profession. The tragedy of its traditional attitude in foreign affairs needs no emphasis.

Ultimately it is with this encroaching industrial State machine that women have been engaged in battle ever since they first sought emancipation. At first confused, they made for the vote. But events have made them aware that unless they emerge from their streamlined or dingy kitchens to demand much more, not only their families but all humanity may stand in great peril.

The clue to Mrs. Pankhurst's crusade lies in a paragraph on the first page of the book "Unshackled" by her daughter Christabel.

"The industrial North is an effectual school of politics and economics, and Mother fully learnt its lesson. The seamy side of industrialism and the manifold need of reform appear there in reality. Smoke-darkened skies, a mixture of smoke and air to breathe, the blotting out of Nature's green life, colourless streets, mean and even insanitary housing, mechanical noise, the monotonous yet precarious toil of wage-earners, the premature tearing from school and play of children, the anxious life of mothers, too scantily fed to bear strong babies, too poor to feed them properly as they grew—these and other plagues were rampant in Lancashire when Mother's days began."

The more sordid features of industrialism may have begun at long last to disappear, but the rigid and close knit organisation on which it depends has become ever more intense, as well as the extreme discipline of mind and body without which the operation of modern devices is impossible. It has become the enemy of all that is spontaneous and anarchic in biological life, those impulses that specifically matter to women. It surprised me that no reviewer remarked on the underlying message of Dürrenmatt's play, the *Physicists*, in which the ridiculing of the wife and sons and the strangling of the nurses was symbolical of women's irrelevance. The final triumph in the play fell to the woman scientist—a crippled travesty of her sex—who imitated men's

evil drive to power by the misuse of science.

Fundamentally, men have always loved themselves and their purposes better than they have loved women. There was a time when superstition enveloped agriculture, fertility was worshipped and there was a cult of goddesses. But as men began to work in metals, to acquire knowledge and skills, superstition declined and patriarchal power began to come into its own. To-day fertility may well be looked upon as a curse rather than a blessing, and therefore imparts no prestige to being a woman.

In a recent book Robert Graves wrote as follows: "In my view the political and social confusion of these last 3,000 years has been entirely due to man's revolt against woman as a priestess of natural magic, and his defeat of her wisdom by the use of intellect." This is of special interest taken side by side with the remarks of Martin James, a psychiatrist, in the Newsom controversy. He is insufficiently condescending. "Many Englishmen of the boarding school class . . . have to relearn from their wives that people can be childish and irrational and are, in fact, *human*; they have been taught to idealise pure logic and reason, often at the expense of emotion. Such husbands serve as yet another unplanned influence which reinforces the ideal of rationality for the woman parent and undermines her child-centred assumptions."

And again: "Women's apparent illogicality is really a devious logic which is a delight both to themselves and their men. It is in fact just as consecutive and sensible in its own way as conceptual rationality based on secondary process and secondary education." (So complacent is Martin James in his conviction that this male "ideal of rationality" must predominate, that it does not even occur to him that, in this instance, it is the masculine education which is misdirected.)

George Meredith is wiser:

Their sense is with their senses all mixed in
Destroyed by subtleties these women are
More brain, O Lord, more brain, or we shall mar
Utterly this fair garden we might win.

And the Chinese writer Han Suyin:

O what a fool what a fool is man, who clutches at the firmament, forgetting that the earth is a star. . . .

I am earth-bound and so remain. I am a woman, obdurate, rooted, clinging to sight and smell and feel, suspicious of abstractions.

What is being said here in various ways is important and significant.

When men first began to use reason, to study mathematics and the universe about them, they found in this an escape from servitude to their biological existence, even, by means of god and religion, the hope of escape from individual death. Women, because of men's sexual needs, were always associated with the animal side of men's natures. In between moments of sexual excitement women did not exist for men, who then felt themselves the cool, rational, spiritual beings which they aspired to become.

And Robert Graves is so right: on this worship of the intellect, on this escapism, on this split between mind and matter, body and soul, men have built their philosophies, their concepts of government, their States, down the ages. With Newton and Cartesian man—"give me matter and motion and I will construct the world"—"reason the charioteer of the passions"—come the notions of the "clockwork universe" and "man's conquest of nature" on which ultimately the industrial states are built.

Power was always the concept on which man based the authority of the State, first the authority of the tyrant, or the divine right of the king, but latterly the worship of mechanism and the thrust of dynamic power. A relic of the old concept is to have a dictator—or old man of the tribe—at the top.

Everything must proceed in tidiness and order. Curves abound in nature—as in women—but in the main curves are "out" so far as architects and planners are concerned. Roads must be wide and straight for the worshipped car, to whose death-dealing propensities there is an astounding indifference. In place of the cathedrals we now have the glass and concrete skyscrapers—symbol, as one of their architects himself recently put it—of virility. The rocket, fed by fire and thrusting into space, is the most perfect phallic symbol of all, except that its warhead carries death instead of the seeds of life. Perhaps that, too, is significant.

To halt this race towards suicide, a new concept of the State and human purpose is required. It is one that will never be achieved by men alone. Women's views must not be brushed aside as of no importance; women must be encouraged to speak and to use that wisdom which they undoubtedly possess, however much overlaid it has become by masculine ascendancy. Women are not by nature escapist, they are, on the whole, at home in the natural world. Giving birth, they do literally create "in the flesh" and there is nothing in animal life that they would despise unless taught—as they have been—to do so. Already the emphasis on natural childbirth is a fresh assertion of women's dignity. Moreover the bearing and rearing of children has become endowed with a new significance by the advances of medicine, psychology, psychiatry and education. Women are aware that parenthood and all those activities that rest upon it, medical care, the schools, the social services, are far more important than training more technologists for industry.

We have begun to understand that we do, in fact, by heredity and environment, create human beings who tend to carry forward the patterns which we set them, and who are, in very truth, the future of our race. This idea, which brought with it the concept of "child-centred" education, is relatively new in our world. It means that we can play a more conscious part in the evolution of humanity.

However much we may admire the achievements of man in science—and no woman would be so ungenerous as to deny them—women do know that man in his intoxication with mechanism and industrial production may well be nearing a dead end. If we are to

make possible further achievements of the human spirit, then we need new people rather than new machines.

Somehow we have to make an end of what Robert Graves so aptly calls the rule of "mechanarchy". It is necessary to reconcile industrial man with his older environment—the world of plants and animals, the world of life and growth, which measures time, not by clocks, but by darkness and the dawn, the weather and the seasons. Man has to learn to curb his restless search for power, learn to live in peace with his fellow men, to stop raping and squandering the resources of our planet for profit and greed.

It is the education of *men* rather than that of women which needs to become more concrete and personal, to deal less in abstractions, theories, and general rational concepts.

Women's achievements have shown that they are well able to cope with an education determined by men, what they look for now is that men's education should move in their direction. Men have made at least one step forward by beginning to resolve the dualism of mind and matter.

Education, our pundits still tell us, must produce more top ranking people trained in science, so that we may be able to compete with our industrial rivals overseas. What nonsense all this is. Is industry to go on expanding and expanding, like the porridge pot in the fairy tale, till it floods all and no one can stop it? Already a large new industry is growing up in the United States for destroying industrial products, so that more may be sold and more profit made.

We have to begin educating boys and girls to be human beings, instead of drilling them in "subjects" for exams and the rat race of a career. They need wider views, not so much narrow specialisation, they need to be able to look at their world as a whole.

At present aggression and competitiveness are still fostered, disobedience to arbitrary authority is still visited with the violence of the cane. Yet much research has shown that these methods induce bad behaviour rather than conformity. Other experiments have shown that it is possible to educate children for democracy, tolerance and co-operation, by measures of self-government, helped by adults who guide but do not stand constantly on their dignity.

Above all it is education for living and human relations which should be uppermost. Both boys and girls need to learn that, whatever fun one may have with sex, its most lovely use is as an instrument of sensitive and subtle understanding. Parenthood should be presented, not as self-satisfaction and self-aggrandizement, but as the most important activity on which both men and women can be engaged. If this were accepted, there would be immense changes in the organisation and direction of our economic and social life.

Rational man, industrial man, man the scientist, man the escapist, sets his sights for a landing on the moon. Meantime he murders and prepares to murder millions of his own kind and ignores other countless millions who are ignorant, starving and diseased. Is it for this that we should live and that women should bear children?

Only by valuing life and creation and by seeing in the nurture of our children the possibilities of our future shall we be able so to shape the purposes of the State that it turns from violence, greed and inhuman planning, to become the true father and mother of the people. Man and woman, neither dominant, working together, could achieve this. So far as we know, such a thing has never yet happened in human history. To see it come to pass is the hope of many young people, both men and women, of this generation.

Are they, too, crying for the moon?

... IN A MAN'S WORLD

THE BEST OF BOTH WORLDS

Harriet Unwin

MORE THAN 100 YEARS AGO the minister who officiated at the wedding of Lucy Stone, an early American feminist, said on that occasion, with male sympathy rare for the age, "I never perform the marriage ceremony without a renewed sense of the iniquity of a system by which man and wife are one, and that one is the husband." The decision to marry at all had cost Lucy great anguish of conscience, in spite of her future husband's allegiance to her own life-work, which in 1855 she defined in these terms: "In education, in marriage, in religion, in everything, disappointment is the lot of woman. It shall be the business of my life to deepen that disappointment in every woman's heart until she bows down to it no longer." Yet in 1955, exactly 100 years after Lucy Stone's declaration, and in spite of all that followed it, we find an American husband plaintively consulting a marriage guidance counsellor: "The way I see it, marriage takes two people, each living his own life and then putting them together. Mary seems to think we both ought to live one life: mine."

Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique* (first published in the U.S.A. in 1963, recently issued here as a 5s. Penguin) charts the sad circular route by which American women have "progressed" since their emancipation to a point where they expect and desire no greater achievement in their own life than can be grasped with one hand while clinging to their husbands' shirt-tails with the other. "The

HARRIET UNWIN was educated at progressive schools in England and at Brown University, Rhode Island. Before her marriage she was National Youth Officer of the United Nations Association and then an Inspector of Factories. She is now a teacher of Liberal Studies in a College for Further Education.

feminine mystique"—the idea that a woman can only find fulfilment through marriage and motherhood and that all other aspects of her life should be ground underfoot in pursuit of that end—has replaced the legal shackles of 19th century women to send their granddaughters scurrying back to the home; and with all the force of "the American way of life" behind the new mystique, it ties them there almost as securely. How did this sorry reversal come about? By what irony do "sweet, womanly" Lucy Stone and her comrades live on in American memory merely as a dirty joke? After Amelia Earhart and Eleanor Roosevelt, what has made "the Happy Housewife Heroine" the only acceptable feminine image in the post-war era? (at least until, in the words of *Life* magazine, this book arrived "to provoke the daylights out of almost everyone who reads it").

Mrs. Friedan asks and answers these questions, and they are relevant enough on this side of the Atlantic for the book to be of interest to readers here. She plots the American voyage of the Good Ship *Feminist*, and scrutinises every barnacle on the reef which sank her. She takes a cool look at today's "castrated" American male, at his empty-headed, boy-crazy sister, and at the American "mom" who produces them. Her main quest is then to discover what has produced this gorgon "mom"—and her answer, with thumping vehemence, is "the feminine mystique".

"In the attempt to live by sex alone, in the image of the feminine mystique, ultimately she must 'castrate' the husband and sons who can never give her enough satisfaction to make up for lack of a self, and pass on to her daughters her own unspoken disappointment, self-denigration and discontent."

Thus the system is self-perpetuating, and permanently galling to women:

"If a culture does not expect human maturity from its women, it does not see its lack as a waste, or as a possible source of neurosis or conflict. The insult, the real reflection on our culture's definition of the role of women, is that as a nation we only noticed that something was wrong with women when we saw its effects on their sons."

Good feminist stuff!

The book is written in that emotional, faintly dramatic style of the women's magazines in which Mrs. Friedan developed hers, and it is frankly a chore to read. The armfuls of documentation may push the reader beyond conviction to the point of ennui (any woman who has juggled her two roles in life will hardly need a whole chapter explaining that "Housewifery Expands to Fill the Time Available"). But the socio-psychological style and weight of the book are deliberate, of course—it is meant to sound authoritative to the layman, and it does.

Certainly the material presented as evidence is fascinating. Freud and his followers, Margaret Mead and her functionalist colleagues, women's magazine editors and the ad-men who pay their salaries, are lined up with college presidents and high school vocational counsellors to take their share of the blame for "burying millions of American women alive". I have never studied Freud, and I am astonished to find that according to his "research into the feminine soul" (as interpreted by his disciples), my interest in abstract ideas and in the fortunes

of human society, even perhaps my innocent affection for mechanical contraptions, are nothing more than "penis-envy". (Penis-pride in men I have long been familiar with as a woman driver, of course, and when the man I have just overtaken at 60 m.p.h. re-overtakes at a hazardous 75 I suppress my irritation defensively: "Ah well, poor fellow—he can't have babies"). The excuse for baiting feminists as penis-coveters can be seen in the words (apocryphal, I hasten to add) attributed to a suffragette bent on The Vote: "Men have a powerful weapon which has been denied to us. It is for us to take this weapon in our hands and turn it to our advantage"—but to leap from this *good* joke (told to me by a lifelong feminist) to the solemn warning contained in an influential American socio-psychological study of 1947, "Feminism . . . was at its core a deep illness," is, as Mrs. Friedan says, colossal cheek.

The indictment of the American "sex-directed educators" for their acceptance if not instigation of the feminine mystique is particularly interesting to me as a graduate of an American University, and now a teacher. From 1945 onwards, Mrs. Friedan tells us, the number of women going to college in the U.S.A. steadily increased, but the number going on from there into the professions fell below the pre-war level. By the early 1960's, two-thirds of women students were dropping out before graduation in the rush to get married and contribute to the baby boom. The curricula of even the most academic women's colleges were "softened" to include "pseudo-scientific marriage courses", studies of "The Family" not as sociological enquiry but as a process of "life-adjustment" in which a scarcely-concealed objective is to equate the "exceptional" with the undesirable (e.g. an "exceptional" woman can combine home and career, but most can't, and therefore if you girls try, it will probably end in neurosis). In the high schools, the process reaches down to the Lolitas with a lesson entitled "The Slick Chick", Do's and Don'ts for Dating, for 11- to 13-year-old girls. It is fair enough to ask, "If an education geared to the growth of the human mind weakens femininity, will an education geared to femininity weaken the growth of the mind?" This chapter contains a lesson for this country, where on the whole education for girls is still education—for remember the good-hearted Sir John Newsom, a year ago in the *Observer*, on "The Education Women Need"? Could this by any chance be "life-adjustment"?

I lived through some of that era in America myself. When I graduated in 1951 the curriculum of my University had not been tampered with (perhaps it has now), but I well remember my slight shame on Graduation Day, with a good degree tucked under my arm but no diamond ring on my finger (in my day the ideal was to achieve *both*). Conditioned by 4 years of the feminine mystique in America, when I returned home I sheepishly sent no word of my activities until 9 years later when—at last—I could report my marriage to the *Alumnæ Bulletin* (in which by that time most of my class-mates were announcing their third or fourth baby). I am ashamed and not a little regretful now to look back on those years of responsible professional work and

to realise how little I put into it or got out of it, waiting for my "real fulfilment". My discontent was partly biology, of course, for most women *do* want to live with men, and in time they *do* want children, but I was disconcerted to find, two years and two babies later, that this was not my only interest in life after all. At the same moment, the sudden death of my husband slammed the door on the outside world, as it then seemed "for ever", and this precipitated a rapid revision of the horizons of my "woman's world". My re-think took only a few weeks, but my efforts to prise open the door again took 1½ years, and were only made possible by my children's remarkably obliging nature, and by our lucky possession of a unique friend, as generous to us with her time and energy as the State is parsimonious to all husbandless mothers and other lame ducks.

I offer my own case-history as an example of how the feminine mystique works. It will suffice as an illustration of Mrs. Friedan's theme for those who do not want to read the book, which perhaps should be required reading for American housewives (and probably is by now), but scarcely for readers of *ANARCHY*. Her interpretations of the work of other social scientists can only be assessed by readers better qualified than I am to judge them (even from my limited knowledge I suspect she is unfair to Margaret Mead). This is a book which goes overboard for one idea, and we may wonder whether some of the symptoms of social malaise which Mrs. Friedan ascribes to the feminine mystique—the apathy and aimlessness of young people, for example—are entirely the result of *that*. In recent years a spate of best-sellers, written with that peculiarly American talent for critical self-analysis which Mrs. Friedan shares, has detailed more than one aspect of a general sickness, and perhaps we have yet to see the definitive diagnosis. Meanwhile, to each physician his own.

The feminine mystique may not (yet?) have cowed women in our somewhat less conformist society, but the problems of women's two roles are illustrated ad nauseam in the correspondence columns of the *Observer*, etc., and usually with an excess of heat over light. For women who are free to choose, the question of whether and when to go back to work can only be a matter for individual judgment, it seems to me, in the face of the conflicting evidence and exhortation offered: Bowlby and "maternal deprivation", Levy and "maternal overprotection", take your pick.¹ It is certainly unfortunate that the shortage of nursery schools allows so few mothers the freedom to choose, for it *cannot* be good for a bored and irritable toddler to be shut up all day with a bored and irritable mother.

All this has been said so many times before, but one point still receives less attention in the Sunday newspapers than it deserves. Newsom gave too little thought to the statistical 30 years or so of post child-bearing life which Western affluence has bestowed on mothers

¹John Bowlby, *Maternal Care and Mental Health* (World Health Organisation, Geneva, 1951); David Levy, *Maternal Overprotection* (Columbia University Press, New York, 1943). I cite these two studies for stylistic purposes only, and do not mean to imply any contradiction in their findings.

of 2 or 3 children (an education which gives them a smattering of the Arts is no answer: the rash of privately-published books of poems, of flower paintings queueing up—and being admitted!—at the Royal Academy is too awful to contemplate)—and by the same token, women who expect to be supported as full-time housewives for all those left-over years are getting off too lightly in a world full of work which badly needs doing. Yet one notices that for every energetic woman pleading for a chance to contribute to the society in which she lives (and somehow sounding selfish in doing so), there is another hoping to be left alone in her woman's world, and managing to convey the self-sacrifice (and "rewards" of course) of doing so. And so 4 or 5 people are rewarded with 3 dozen pots of jam mouldering in the larder "while the children of Europe are starving", as I used to be told at school. As one such woman, "made 'supremely happy' not because of my academic education . . . but by the birth of my children" so rightly concludes, "My kind of life clearly needs loving men to maintain it". If there were enough such men to go round, as apparently there are in America, the feminine mystique might really have us by the throat! A housewife's contribution to the work of the world need not be measured in insurance stamps, of course, but save us at least from the American Dream—thrice-weekly canasta for bored suburban wives, and coronary thrombosis for their husbands.

What I can never find in the columns of the *Observer*—still less in Mrs. Friedan's book—is any thorough exploration of the crucial questions which seem to me to arise if women are ever to achieve real equality with men. These questions—which are interrelated—arise in aspects of the problem which are frequently discussed in print, but in which the real issues are apparently too uncomfortable to face.

Mrs. Friedan thinks that one way to counteract the new subjection of women in America is to discourage early marriage. Her reasons for this are valid enough: girls, and boys too, should reach a certain maturity before plunging into marriage and all it entails. Yet all she can offer is the conventional plea for continence: to replace sex as the "easy solace" for hard work and the growing-pains of independence, teenagers should be urged "to endure discomfort, to make an effort, to postpone present pleasure for future long-term goals". Surely this is a lost battle if we are only prepared to fight it with that old blunderbuss!—aimed only at girls, of course, for we have long turned a blind eye to what boys get up to in the park after school.

There are two points involved here. In the first place, sex is obviously a field in which equality for women is long overdue, in which we still allow boys to feel normal in gaining pre-marital experience and girls to feel guilty (and sometimes to get pregnant) while doing the same. And secondly, so long as wedlock is the only socially acceptable means for young people to satisfy their sexual desire, we shall continue to watch helplessly while they marry in haste and perhaps repent at leisure. The kind of maturity that marriage needs comes from emotional experience, and emotional experience comes from love affairs. (The paradox of urging young people to swot for

their G.C.E. and University exams while blithely expecting them to pass the "final" of their emotional life with no preparation at all, apparently escapes the conventional moralist.) If we really want to discourage early marriage, isn't it time we used a modern weapon?—sensible advice (including contraceptive information) to equip boys and girls for sexual experience before they marry, and a corresponding revision of the double standard.

But is early marriage necessarily a bad thing? There are good physiological arguments for it, and also for the proposition that it is unrealistic to expect girls at least to follow intellectual pursuits at an age when their thoughts "naturally" turn towards marriage and child-bearing. It was easy enough for me not to drop out of college before graduation, because nobody asked me to—and certainly it is convenient, in the present social set-up, to keep in step in the "qualifying race". But as a "mature student" for a year in my 30's I certainly worked harder and got more out of my studies than I did as an undergraduate in my teens. If more women started degree courses at 35, they would not feel out of place among their fellow-students, and I believe they might give their work the serious attention which realistic teachers have regretfully ceased to expect from young girls. The prevailing assumption that education and youth go together is hard on men too—for in spite of further education, it requires great determination to recover missed chances later in life—but it is harder on women simply because, while most young men can become parents and pursue their education, most young women can't. For this very reason, *special* provision to enable women to do so later is a concession to their physiological role which they have a perfect right to ask.

Even so, the young mother setting out for a Physics degree—or returning to her former work—at present still needs grannies and an especially helpful husband to make it possible at all. In practical terms, the two-role problem for all women who face it comes down to one question: Who is going to shop and clean and give the kids their tea? For many the question need not even arise if there were more opportunities for part-time work—not only for secretaries and chocolate packers, but for women doctors and engineers and architects. Certainly the professional woman with young children has the right to part-time motherhood as well as to part-time work. But long overdue concessions by employers would not entirely solve the domestic help problem, especially for the woman who wants or needs to work full-time.

"Woman's work" in the home has a far lower status in our society than its complexity and skill deserve—perhaps because women have always done it—and nowadays few women will freely choose it as a means of livelihood, full or part-time, in preference to assembling radios in a local factory. Low prestige is of course not the only reason why "domestic work" does not appeal to them, yet the middle-class woman who begrudges 5s. an hour to one woman for scrubbing an empty, cold house while she cheerfully hands over 30s. to a young *coiffeuse* for an hour in her scented salon is still naïvely surprised,

even indignant, at the shortage of chars. No doubt she will continue as long as she can to muddle on with *au pairs* and unreliable dailies, and it will be left to the middle man—in this case the domestic agency—to improve the conditions and pay of “domestic work” until it achieves recognition as a trade (of “Home Economics”?), which perhaps even men will not feel it demeaning to enter. This respectable status has already been acquired by “Domestic Science” in the institutional sphere, and London domestic agencies, at least, have started the up-grading process for similar work in the home. Inevitably, in a society gone mad for bits of paper, before long certificates rather than “refs” will be needed to practise it, but at least this will confer on housewifery the badge of vocational status which it merits. Many women do not dislike household work, which in itself offers far more variety and satisfaction than most “women’s work” in industry (and this, in any case, will become scarcer with automation). If running another woman’s home, full or part-time, can be made an attractive alternative to the conveyor-belt, boredom may be alleviated for more than one trapped woman. The mother who works will still have to weigh the cost of help against her own earnings, and the student-mother will have to pay for it out of her grant—but at least they would both have a choice which at present the scarcity of “help” denies them.

Now what about the education of girls before they marry? Here we run up against another double standard. Newsom’s “sex-directed” education is not, he says, for “the 5 per cent of really intellectual women whom nothing will stop having careers”.² Similarly, Mrs. Friedan is only concerned with “intelligent” women, for whom her panacea is later marriage and a “non-sex-directed” education which will encourage them to play two roles instead of one. But this is a problem at *all* intellectual levels in our society. “Less able” girls are also getting married younger and enjoying labour-saving devices—and in this country, at least, having fewer children. At the same time, their husbands are facing the increased leisure which automation will bring, and some of that extra time could be spent on fatherhood. Bringing up children is both a chore and a delight—two good reasons why fathers should play a greater part in it.³ Thus in secondary education we have a double problem on our hands: to educate girls for work as well as for home life, and boys for home life as well as for work. Surely the solution is to stick the two halves together and educate both sexes for *all* aspects of their lives—for work, for parent-

²“The Education Women Need”, *Observer*, 6.9.64.

³At least one father (John Rowe Townsend, “About Fatherhood”, *The Guardian*, 9.8.65) foresees this development and seems to be looking forward to it: “There is not . . . any great tradition of fatherly interest in children’s pursuits. . . . And the bringing up of children has always been ‘woman’s work’. But in the present century we are going through a whole series of revolutions. . . . The idea is getting around pretty fast, even if not fast enough, that marriage must be a fifty-fifty partnership. So bringing up the children ought surely to be a shared activity more than ever before. In fact one of the blessings of a fairly rich, leisured and literate society like ours should be an unprecedented flowering of family life.”

hood, and for leisure?

Margaret Mead, as well as suggesting the “social convenience” of encouraging boys and girls in our society to fit themselves into the accepted “masculine” and “feminine” patterns of it, also described the kind of society *I* should like to see. This society

“might also permit the development of many contrasting temperamental gifts in each sex. It would abandon its various attempts to make boys fight and to make girls remain passive, or to make all children fight. . . . No child would be relentlessly shaped to one pattern of behaviour, but instead there should be many patterns, in a world that had learned to allow to each individual the pattern which was most congenial to his gifts.”⁴

The education system consistent with this society is of course not an abstract, rational one for boys and clever girls, and a concrete, personalised one for the rest. It is a balanced combination of both, a system designed to give scope for every interest and to foster any aptitude whether it occurs in girl or boy. It is one in which boys and girls alike are encouraged to study *any* subject which interests them, not steered into fields “appropriate” to their sex; in which preparation for motherhood is coupled with preparation for fatherhood, cookery classes opened to boys and wood-work to girls. In other words, an education for individuals, not stereotypes, and a preparation not just for one role ahead (or two), but for a “whole” life.

Will this kind of education produce a race of neuters? I doubt it. “Teaching a woman to be feminine is about as essential as teaching a fish to swim,” as another *Observer* correspondent noted; and to judge by my own little boys, instinctive “male” behaviour has rather to be restrained than encouraged if little boys are even to survive to manhood. On the contrary, if a “sexless” education produces less “feminine” women and less “masculine” men, all to the good. The he-man/she-woman dichotomy is another of those culturally-produced barriers like black/white and rich/poor, which we should be concerned to break down, not bolster up, through education. Our society’s reluctance to allow any natural outlet for “masculine” qualities in women and “feminine” qualities in men is not only a waste of those abilities, but a recognised cause of neurosis. It is also one of the things which keeps the war of the sexes going.

How I would love to see the end of that war! It is difficult, especially for a woman, not to take sides in the battle so long as we still suffer the injustices which started it, but when Mrs. Friedan demands recognition that “before we are women, we are human beings”, I long for the day when feminists will be able to see men too as human beings *first*. For me, the male/female dichotomy resolves itself at the personal level. Of all the people I know, the ones I like and admire most are women with grit and independence, and men with tenderness and compassion. It is no coincidence that those women have not confined their energy and interests to the home, and that those men are better-than-average husbands and fathers. They are all people who have really made the best of both worlds—who in fact

⁴Margaret Mead, *From The South Seas*, New York, 1939, p 321. Quoted by Mrs. Friedan on p 128 of the Dell paperback edition of *The Feminine Mystique*.

have escaped from our cultural habit of dividing one life into two distinct spheres.

If current trends are assisting the development of home interests and skills among men, more's the pity that even now, too often the only thing that encourages (or forces) women to lift their eyes from their cooking-pots is a period of manlessness, chosen or enforced. Few women relish this state—and still less the ignominy which our society attaches to it—but it does offer an opportunity for self-realisation as a "person" which is valuable in itself, and not merely as "compensation" for the comfortable cloak of marriage. To me it seems a pity that for so many wives and mothers—inhibited by practical difficulties, by their own inertia, and perhaps by "the feminine mystique"—this dimension of life will never be fully explored. With some allowances made for the period when children are young, I can see no reason except cultural habit why women should not function in two spheres, as men in our society have been doing for centuries. I hope that increasing numbers of both sexes will enjoy the pleasures and suffer the trials of each other's spheres, until the dividing line between the two begins to fade. We might then at last have one world which both men and women could equally share.

... IN A MAN'S WORLD

DISCRIMINATION SURVIVES

WOMEN (National Council for Civil Liberties. 2s. 6d.)

THIS NEW PAMPHLET sets out the facts and figures on discrimination in Britain—a discrimination not racial but sexual. Is discrimination too strong a word? No, declare the authors, for "discrimination against any group involves distinguishing the group by a single common characteristic and making total assumptions about the nature, role and abilities of the individuals concerned. It is by no means an abstract question because discrimination deprives people, in effect, of their fair share of the benefits of a society to which they subscribe. It whittles away their enjoyment of their full rights as citizens and their personal liberty to enjoy how to live, work and earn."

And they go on to show how this discrimination operates against women in education, employment prospects, the professions, industrial work, in the laws relating to marriage, the guardianship of children, income tax and so on, and in public life.

An aspect which is insufficiently brought out, is that of social class. Much discussion of the problems of women starts from middle-

class assumptions. (For example, women's dilemma is often posed as "Home versus Career", but a working-class woman does not have a career. Like her husband she simply has a job.) The middle class woman has infinitely greater freedom of choice, simply because she is better off. She can for example afford, however grudgingly, domestic help. There remain too, in some older industrial areas, social attitudes towards women, which the struggle for emancipation has still not touched.

We are reminded of this in the study by Dennis, Henriques and Slaughter, *Coal is our Life: an analysis of a Yorkshire mining community*. The social and family life of 'Ashton', the town they describe, is dominated by the pit and the three-shift system of working. It is a male society and its leisure is centred round the pub, the working-men's club and the bookie's office. The children of Ashton grow into a set of attitudes and ideas which consciously exclude women from the activities and permitted liberties of the male group. Boys are destined to be miners and girls to be miners' wives. "Their personalities must conform to the requirements of their roles in society." Old habits in child-rearing survive in Ashton. Rubber comforters or 'dummies' are still widely used, often to the age of four or five. In the whole of the West Riding, there were, at the time this survey was made, only four birth control clinics, run by voluntary bodies. The nearest to Ashton was seven miles away. Induced miscarriages and post-natal troubles are, declare the authors, "largely responsible for the obvious physical decline in married women". In this connection they describe two sisters, Jean and Mary. Jean is not very intelligent but has a talent for entertainment and "letting herself go" in company, and Mary is thoughtful with a bright and charming personality:

"Now these two women are a good illustration of the destiny of women in this male-dominated community, for despite their varying potentialities they are both being moulded to the same shape. This statement is true physically as well as in terms of personality. One notes in Ashton, as in other mining areas, the rapid decline in physical beauty among the younger married women. By the late twenties they are often flat-chested, all colour and freshness have left their faces, and they seem to be hardly concerned at all with their physical attractiveness. . . ."

"When a woman does express any interest in politics or other general topics, she speaks rather apologetically, and can be prepared for her husband to tell her not to interrupt intelligent conversation—"What the hell do you know about it?""

... IN A MAN'S WORLD

THE TRAGEDY OF WOMAN'S EMANCIPATION

Emma Goldman

I BEGIN WITH AN ADMISSION: Regardless of all political and economic theories, treating of the fundamental differences between various groups within the human race, regardless of class and race distinctions, regardless of all artificial boundary lines between woman's rights and man's rights, I hold that there is a point where these differentiations may meet and grow into one perfect whole.

With this I do not mean to propose a peace treaty. The general social antagonism which has taken hold of our entire public life today, brought about through the force of opposing and contradictory interests, will crumble to pieces when the reorganisation of our social life, based upon the principles of economic justice, shall have become a reality.

Peace or harmony between the sexes and individuals does not necessarily depend on a superficial equalisation of human beings; nor does it call for the elimination of individual traits and peculiarities. The problem that confronts us today, and which the nearest future is to solve, is how to be one's self and yet in oneness with others, to feel deeply with all human beings and still retain one's own characteristic qualities. This seems to me to be the basis upon which the mass and the individual, the true democrat and the true individuality, man and woman, can meet without antagonism and opposition. The motto should not be: **Forgive one another**; rather, **Understand one another**. The oft-quoted sentence of Madame de Stael: "To understand everything is to forgive everything", has never particularly appealed to me; it has the odour of the confessional; to forgive one's fellow-beings conveys the idea of pharisaical superiority. To understand one's fellow-being suffices. The admission partly represents the fundamental aspect of my views on the emancipation of woman and its effect upon the entire sex.

EMMA GOLDMAN's lecture "The Tragedy of Woman's Emancipation" from which we reprint extracts was given sixty years ago, and published in her *Anarchism and other Essays* in 1911. The biography *Rebel in Paradise*, by Richard Drinnon, which does justice to her as a pioneer of feminism and of birth control propaganda, as well as a tireless propagandist for anarchism, was published by the University of Chicago in 1961.

Emancipation should make it possible for woman to be human in the truest sense. Everything within her that craves assertion and activity should reach its fullest expression; all artificial barriers should be broken, and the road towards greater freedom cleared of every trace of centuries of submission and slavery.

This was the original aim of the movement for woman's emancipation, but the results so far achieved have isolated woman and have robbed her of the fountain springs of that happiness which is so essential to her. Merely external emancipation has made of the modern woman an artificial being, who reminds one of the products of French arboriculture with its arabesque trees and shrubs, pyramids, wheels and wreaths; anything, except the forms which would be reached by the expression of her own inner qualities. Such artificially grown plants of the female sex are to be found in large numbers, especially in the so-called intellectual sphere of our life.

Liberty and equality for women! What hopes and aspirations these words awakened when they were first uttered by some of the noblest and bravest souls of those days. The sun in all his light and glory was to rise upon a new world; in this world woman was to be free to **direct her own destiny**—an aim certainly worthy of the great enthusiasm, courage, perseverance, and ceaseless effort of the tremendous host of pioneer men and women, who staked everything against a world of prejudice and ignorance.

My hopes also move towards that goal, but I hold that the emancipation of women, as interpreted and practically applied today, has failed to reach that great end. Now, woman is confronted with the necessity of emancipating herself from emancipation, if she really desires to be free. This may sound paradoxical, but is, nevertheless, only too true.

What has she achieved through her emancipation? Equal suffrage in a few States. Has that purified our political life, as many well-meaning advocates predicted. Certainly not. Incidentally, it is really time that persons with plain, sound judgement should cease to talk about corruption in politics in a boarding-school tone. Corruption in politics has nothing to do with the morals, or the laxity of morals, of various political personalities. Its cause is altogether a material one. Politics is the reflex of the business and industrial world, the mottoes of which are: "To take is more blessed than to give"; "buy cheap and sell dear"; "one soiled hand washes the other". There is no hope even that woman, with her right to vote, will ever purify politics.

Emancipation has brought woman economic equality with man; that is, she can choose her own profession and trade; but as her past and present physical training has not equipped her with the necessary strength to compete with man, she is often compelled to exhaust all her energy, use up all her vitality, and strain every nerve in order to reach the market value. Very few ever succeed, for it is a fact that woman teachers, doctors, lawyers, architects, and engineers are neither met with the same confidence as their male colleagues, nor receive equal remuneration. And those that do reach that enticing equality,

generally do so at the expense of their physical and psychical well-being. As to the great mass of working girls and women, how much independence is gained if the narrowness and lack of freedom of the home is exchanged for the narrowness and lack of freedom of the factory, sweatshop, department store, or office? In addition is the burden which is laid on many women of looking after a "home, sweet home"—cold, dreary, disorderly, uninviting—after a day's hard work. Glorious independence! No wonder that hundreds of girls are so willing to accept the first offer of marriage, sick and tired of their "independence" behind the counter, at the sewing or typewriting machine. They are just as ready to marry as girls of the middle class, who long to throw off the yoke of parental supremacy. A so-called independence which leads only to earning the merest subsistence is not so enticing, not so ideal, that one could expect woman to sacrifice everything for it. Our highly praised independence is, after all, but a slow process of dulling and stifling woman's nature, her love instinct, and her mother instinct.

Nevertheless, the position of the working girl is far more natural and human than that of her seemingly more fortunate sister in the more cultured professional walks of life—teachers, physicians, lawyers, engineers, etc., who have to make a dignified, proper appearance, while the inner life is growing empty and dead.

The narrowness of the existing conception of woman's independence and emancipation; the dread of love for a man who is not her social equal; the fear that love will rob her of her freedom and independence; the horror that love or the joy of motherhood will only hinder her in the full exercise of her profession—all these together make of the emancipated modern woman a compulsory vestal, before whom life, with its great clarifying sorrows and its deep entrancing joys, rolls on without touching or gripping her soul.

Emancipation, as understood by the majority of its adherents and exponents, is of too narrow a scope to permit the boundless love and ecstasy contained in the deep emotion of the true woman, sweetheart, mother, in freedom.

The tragedy of the self-supporting or economically free woman does not lie in too many, but in too few experiences. True, she surpasses her sister of past generations in knowledge of the world and human nature; it is just because of this that she feels deeply the lack of life's essence, which alone can enrich the human soul, and without which the majority of women have become mere professional automatons.

That such a state of affairs was bound to come was foreseen by those who realised that, in the domain of ethics, there still remained many decaying ruins of the time of the undisputed superiority of man; ruins that are still considered useful. And, what is more important, a goodly number of the emancipated are unable to get along without them. Every movement that aims at the destruction of existing institutions and the replacement thereof with something more advanced, more perfect, has followers who in theory stand for the most radical ideas, but who, nevertheless, in their every-day practice, are like the average

Philistine, feigning respectability and clamouring for the good opinion of their opponents. There are, for example, socialists, and even anarchists, who stand for the idea that property is robbery, yet who will grow indignant if anyone owes them the value of a half-dozen pins. The same Philistine can be found in the movement for woman's emancipation. . . .

The greatest shortcoming of the emancipation of the present day lies in its artificial stiffness and its narrow respectabilities, which produce an emptiness in woman's soul that will not let her drink from the fountain of life. I once remarked that there seemed to be a deeper relationship between the old-fashioned mother and hostess, ever on the alert for the happiness of her little loved ones and the comfort of those she loved, and the truly new woman, than between the latter and her average emancipated sister. The disciples of emancipation pure and simple declared me a heathen, fit only for the stake. Their blind zeal did not let them see that my comparison between the old and the new was merely to prove that a goodly number of our grandmothers had more blood in their veins, far more humour and wit, and certainly a greater amount of naturalness, kind-heartedness, and simplicity, than the majority of our emancipated professional women who fill the colleges, halls of learning, and various offices. This does not mean a wish to return to the past, nor does it condemn woman to her old sphere, the kitchen and the nursery.

We are in need of unhampered growth out of old traditions and habits. The movement for woman's emancipation has so far made but the first step in that direction. It is to be hoped that it will gather strength to make another. The right to vote, or equal civil rights, may be good demands, but true emancipation begins neither at the polls nor in courts. It begins in woman's soul. History tells us that every oppressed class gained true liberation from its masters through its own efforts. It is necessary that woman learn that lesson, that she realise that her freedom will reach as far as her power to achieve her freedom reaches. It is, therefore, far more important for her to begin with her inner regeneration, to cut loose from the weight of prejudices, traditions, and customs. The demand for equal rights in every vocation of life is just and fair; but, after all, the most vital right is the right to love and be loved. Indeed, if partial emancipation is to become a complete and true emancipation of woman, it will have to do away with the ridiculous notion that to be loved, to be sweetheart and mother, is synonymous with being slave or subordinate. It will have to do away with the absurd notion of the dualism of the sexes, or that man and woman represent two antagonistic worlds.

MR. JAMES AND SERGEANT CHALLENGOR

Martin Ennals

THE JAMES REPORT ON THE CASE OF DETECTIVE-SGT. CHALLENGOR makes very sad reading. For nearly 9 weeks Mr. James sat, benign, avuncular, bespectacled and bald, shining down upon a battery of barristers; giving confidence to the witnesses and courtesy to the lawyers. No-one could have been more fair, patient and tolerant; no-one more willing to listen or anxious to learn.

The more therefore the surprise of the total whitewash of the published report. The first impression upon reading "Report of Inquiry" (Cmd. 2735, price 11/- from HMSO) is that Mr. James has never really lived; that he has passed through a world full of Dixons but never spent an hour in a real police station or among real policemen; heard them talk, listened to their humour or understood what made them tick. The rather naïve criticism of the fact that police notebooks should be safely kept for a reasonable period, so as to be available for inspection, confirmed that he was ignorant of normal police procedure and one wondered why his assistant, Commander William Willis, a retired senior police officer, did not enlighten him that no new notebook is issued to a policeman without his old one being handed in. The loss of relevant notebooks could not therefore be carelessness. Just possibly perhaps it could be by design?

The James report is three pages long with 168 pages of appendices. He concludes that Challenor suffered the onset of paranoid schizophrenia, "a mental illness", from the month of April 1963 and remained on duty apart from leave until 6th September, 1963. "Prior to July 1963 there were no manifestations or symptoms which at the time could be attributed to mental illness even by an expert in psychological medicine." . . . The only person who could have known was his wife who, with commendable loyalty, failed to inform his superiors, his doctors or apparently Challenor himself.

"The known behaviour of Det.-Sgt. Challenor did not necessarily point to mental illness and was consistent with the causes to which it was attributed." . . . "The failure to recognise or suspect mental illness on the part of Detective-Sergeant Challenor's superior officers prior to

MARTIN ENNALS, who is General Secretary of the National Council for Civil Liberties, discusses here Mr. A. E. James's report of his inquiry into the Challenor Case. Donald Room's own story was published in ANARCHY 36 and Mary Grigg's Penguin Special, The Challenor Case was reviewed in ANARCHY 49.

his return from holiday on 5th August, 1965, cannot be criticised." In other words, everything that Challenor did could have been done by an ordinary policeman and therefore was not recognised as the onset of mental illness. No-one is to blame.

It is in the light of these statements and conclusions that one has to examine the appendices in which Mr. Justice James, with great care, sets out the accusations against Challenor and his comrades at West End Central and the opinions which he has formed of the various incidents.

Finally, before the individual cases, it is worth referring to Mr. James' consideration of a submission made to him that there was an atmosphere at West End Central Police Station in which junior police officers could perform improper acts providing that no-one else found out. In Mr. James own words: "If the evidence established that such was the atmosphere at West End Central Police Station it surely would have been a contributory cause to Detective-Sgt. Challenor remaining on duty, and a serious situation. I have reached the conclusion that the evidence does not support the submission made and that there was no such cause enabling Detective-Sgt. Challenor's mental illness to be undetected."

We have therefore two things to look for in the appendices: first, the behaviour of Challenor which, while not attributable to mental illness, could have been attributable to other factors, e.g., over-tiredness, exuberance of character, enthusiasm, etc. Secondly, the atmosphere in West End Central in which Challenor worked which Mr. James found to be normal but which others suggested might be conducive to "wrongful acts and omissions".

Challenor averaged 12½ hours per day for every working day in 1963 but his colleague Etheridge worked slightly longer hours. Both were responsible for training CID aides who hoped to leave the uniform branch and join the ranks of the detectives. Three of Challenor's "aides" are now serving lengthy sentences.

There is no need here to go into the medical evidence. It seems irrelevant to the issues which are at stake. The question is not whether or when Challenor was ill, but rather when did he and his colleagues frame certain people and was this typical or acceptable or explicable behaviour at the time. There is no doubt that bricks were planted on seven or eight people on the night of 11th July, 1963. Donald Room, Gregory Hill, Ronald Ede and John Apostolou were all charged by Challenor with being in possession of the offensive weapons. Room was found not guilty on a balance of doubt in the mind of the magistrate, Mr. Robey, after the submission of scientific evidence that no bricks had ever been near his pocket. Apostolou was found guilty on similar evidence before the same magistrate on the same day but won an appeal. Ede and Hill, after several abortive appearances before a juvenile court, had no evidence offered against them but no costs awarded either. In addition (unmentioned by James), four other young persons, utterly unconnected with demonstrations, were equally charged with being in possession of bricks on the same night. Challenor

was not involved. Three of them were found guilty, did not appeal and were subsequently pardoned. One was found not guilty on the first occasion. None of these were involved in the James enquiry because Challenor was not concerned. They must, however, have been relevant to any considerations as to whether there was an atmosphere in West End Central conducive to the planting of weapons. Mr. James heard evidence from the father of one of this second group but from none of the accused themselves. It is strange to think that, despite this information which he undoubtedly possessed, Mr. James did not feel that this was relevant to his overall judgement on the moeurs of West End Central policemen.

The evidence of Rooum and Ede and Hill is taken carefully in the report. However, Rooum was over-confident: "he was well versed in his evidence and his apparent enjoyment in the giving thereof detracted from his objectivity . . ." . . . "he described himself . . . as an anarchist and a member of the National Council for Civil Liberties. His evidence and demeanour at the enquiry confirmed this".

Hill, on the other hand, was only 14 and rather nervous. So Mr. James says, "I cannot place reliance upon the evidence of this witness when it was uncorroborated for the simple reason that at the time of the Inquiry his recollection of the events was very poor". That disposes of Hill. He lacked confidence and could not be believed.

Ede, too, gives Mr. James little trouble although he can only express his disbelief on one isolated point in the evidence, not on the overall story. However here, too, James is able to say "I am unable to accept his evidence on this point".

However, Mr. James finally agrees that Rooum was subject to some force at the hands of Challenor, Ede and Hill had their ears boxed, and there was unnecessary delay in charging the youths who were arrested. Despite all evidence to the contrary, however, Mr. James (and only Mr. James I think) is satisfied that only Challenor was to blame. Indeed Challenor was reported that night by other officers for his exaggerated behaviour but his immediate superior was unimpressed as the events "merged into an existing background of facts known to him". This statement by James alone should seem to me to be an adequate indication that there was an atmosphere at West End Central into which Challenor's behaviour merged as into a normal background. The quotations of course are from Mr. James.

From 11th July onward, Mr. James is prepared to consider that Challenor was deranged. But what of the earlier cases of Pedrini and others back in 1962 who had made identical allegations against Challenor and others about the way weapons were planted and who were freed by the Court of Criminal Appeal; and King and Silver in April of 1963 who also had alleged that they were planted (with detonators)? Subsequently King was granted a free pardon after serving his 14 months inside. What about Pink, Francis and others in May 1963 who had convictions of offensive weapons quashed by the Court of Appeal later the same year after Challenor had been found to be ill? All of these cases preceded the time when James is

prepared to admit that Challenor was ill. All of them involved other police officers and came from the "atmosphere" of West End Central Police Station. King has been granted his "pardon" and offered compensation. The detonator must therefore have been planted on him but Mr. James finds that "the reliable evidence strongly points to the conclusion that Detective-Sgt. Challenor did not plant the detonators in the cushion but did make the genuine discovery thereof, and that is my conclusion". We are left therefore with the rather lame explanation of "a person aggrieved at Mr. King placing the detonators in his cushion and then taking steps to ensure that Detective-Sgt. Challenor heard that Mr. King was in the West End with explosives".

Another instance of curious logic comes in the case of Francis who had alleged that a police constable presented him with a chopper in the presence of some other officers including Challenor. Francis had a clean record and had been picked up when leaving the Establishment Club with three others. Mr. James comments "In all at least eight police officers were intimately connected with the alleged wicked conduct of fabricating evidence and the use of violence and a number of other officers must have been aware of what was taking place if the evidence of Mr. Pink, Mr. Francis and Mr. Bridgeman and the complaint by Mr. Brown are true. If the conduct of fabricating evidence or tolerance of the use of violence is contended to be evidence of the onset of mental illness in the case of Det.-Sgt. Challenor, then it is evidence of the onset of mental illness on the part of the other officers concerned." This conclusion Mr. James quite rightly rejects; but he also therefore feels that the evidence as such must be rejected.

What the report seems to ignore at all stages is that the interests of the policemen giving evidence is to deny that anything improper ever occurred—otherwise they themselves would be to blame. On the other hand the witnesses directly involved have nothing to win or lose, now that the cases are long since over, in saying exactly what did happen. This makes their evidence perhaps a little more trustworthy than Mr. James ever appears to consider it.

Throughout the document Mr. James accepts police evidence wherever it is disputed by others. He is selective of what to believe almost to a point of farce: for example he accepts half a sentence from Mr. Francis where he alleges that he asked to see the Superintendent and that Challenor came over to him, but he rejects the other half of the sentence where he alleges that Challenor himself claimed to be the Superintendent. "I consider Mr. Francis to be an unreliable witness."

Going back further to where the cases originally started for the National Council for Civil Liberties; Mr. James rejects again all evidence submitted that weapons were planted on Ricardo Pedrini and others in September 1962. Pedrini had a clean record, but was sentenced to 7 years for alleged conspiracy to obtain money with menaces and being in possession of offensive weapons, namely an iron bar. He refused to sign for the bar in the police station as he said that it was nothing to do with him, he was allegedly cuffed on the face and his account of Challenor's behaviour, eight months before the

first inkling of the truth began to seep through, coincides almost word for word with the allegations in the brick and other cases. His family, and those of the others involved, battled incessantly to establish their innocence and they were finally released after an appeal in 1964 after 18 months had been served. Once again the evidence depended on policemen versus people who have either a record or have little experience in impressing a court with their veracity. Pedrini himself has a clean record and so had one of the others. They were however not technically good witnesses; they were nervous and ill-educated.

The police impress in the box but surely a Judge should be accustomed to bearing these matters in mind when assessing credibility.

Mr. James and I both heard weeks of evidence during the enquiry. I had the advantage over him in having worked constantly on the case for many months beforehand and getting the information without the fearful oppression of publicity and a barrage of barristers' questions. In my own mind I am convinced that the report gives a totally inaccurate picture of happenings during Challenor's occupation of a seat at West End Central Police Station between 1962 and 1963. It cannot be coincidence that all the policemen are right and all the other witnesses unreliable. But even if this is so Mr. James has shown up an astonishing state of affairs from which the public must be left to draw their own conclusions. It is admitted (without criticism apparently) that Padmore, Rooum, Hill and Ede were all assaulted; that Braggins, Matthew, Ireland and Steel were arrested without sufficient evidence to justify arrest and there were serious delays in charging them after they were detained; that there were breaches of discipline, errors of judgement, aggressive attitudes, etc., etc. But "not one of them at the time could reasonably have been attributed to mental illness".

This surely is the main point: All these things happen, others besides Challenor, saw, knew and assisted at various stages; but none of them thought of blaming it on mental illness, it was just in the normal course of events or part of the "existing background of facts".

Civil Liberties forced the whole Challenor case into the open. We cannot let the matter rest at the publication of the report.

Donald Rooum took up his stand with a banner saying "LAMBRAKIS R.I.P." (referred to by Mr. Justice James as "one Lambrakis, a Greek, whom he believed to have been murdered"). Lambrakis was murdered; Rooum was framed. In both cases responsibility must be clear; not the man who did the deed but the system which allowed it to happen. Unless the police system is changed, Challenors will flourish.

ANARCHY 54 discussed the ideas of Martin Buber, Gustav Landauer and Erich Mühsam. Readers wrote about it: "Marvellous and much needed. A very welcome issue" (C.R., London); "You have brought forward a really valuable discussion" (R.W., Norfolk); "I enjoyed it very much. It all goes together very well" (N.W., London); "I have long had a suspicion that Landauer had much to say that we could make use of. I am awfully glad that you have brought him to life." (D.W., New York).

ANARCHY 51 was our Blues, R 'n' B, Pop, Folk issue. Albert McCarthy, writing in *Jazz Monthly*, declared that it was "quite simply, the best introduction to the subject that is available."

ANARCHY 36: Arms of the Law, contained Donald Rooum's account of his adventures with Detective-Sergeant Challenor. "Any-one," commented *The Guardian*, "who can't wait for the Director of Public Prosecution's verdict on what went on is referred to ANARCHY 36." And Tom Driberg, in the *Sunday Citizen*, called it "the most vivid and detailed account by a victim that I have yet seen."

These and many other back issues of ANARCHY are available from Freedom Press, 17a Maxwell Road, London, S.W.6.
